



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,269	10/20/2004	Hiroshi Mori	260276US0PCT	4216
22850	7590	04/25/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER TELLER, ROY R	
			ART UNIT 1654	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/511,269	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MORI, HIROSHI	
	<b>Examiner</b> ROY TELLER	<b>Art Unit</b> 1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-13 and 15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/04, 5/06</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's election with traverse of group I, claims 1-14 and 16 in the reply filed on 11/30/07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the examiner has not carried the burden of providing any reasons and/or examples to support the conclusion that the claims of the restricted groups are patentably distinct, or providing any reasons and/or examples to support any conclusions that the groups lack unity of invention. This is not found persuasive because the examiner pointed out in the restriction requirement that group I is drawn to a vast permutation of a modified amino acid sequence compound, whereas the invention of group II is drawn to an antibody, which is clearly distinct therefrom. The examiner further pointed out that because the inventions were distinct for the reasons given that there would be a serious burden on the examiner in view of the different classifications of the inventions. See, for example, restriction requirement, pages 2-3. The examiner further required applicant to elect a single disclosed species of the vast permutation of a modified amino acid sequence compound: a single embodiment, with all structural features fully identified, including each and every variable so as to completely define a singular structural compound. Applicant chose formula I in example 1 from page 17 of the instant specification, synthesis of the compound Boc-Leu\*-Val-Met-Leu-OMe, wherein "\*" indicates that the peptide bond "-CO-NH-" between the Leu and the Val is replaced with a hydroxyethylene group "-CHOH-CH<sub>2</sub>-".

Claims 5-13 and 15 are withdrawn as being drawn to non-elected species of the elected invention. Claims 5-13 do not read on the elected species thereof. Claim 15 does not read upon the elected invention.

Claims 1-4, 14 and 16 are under examination, as they read upon the elected species of formula I in example 1, which is deemed to be instant SEQ ID NO: 3.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statements, received 10/20/04 and 5/26/06, are acknowledged. A signed copy of each is enclosed hereto.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 14 and 16 objected to because of the following informalities: For depending upon a non-elected claim. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This is a “written description” rejection, rather than an enablement rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 “Written Description” Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

*Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurka*, 19 USPQ2d 1111, states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention, for purposes of the “written description” inquiry, is *whatever is now claimed*” (see page 1117).

A review of the language of the claim indicates that these claims are drawn to a genus, i.e., the genus of a compound consisting of an amino acid sequence which consists of at least three consecutive amino acids of the amino acid sequence, SEQ ID NO: 1 (Val-Val-Ile-Ala-Thr-Val-Ile-Val-Ile-Thr-Leu-Val-Met-Leu-Lys-Lys-Lys, Including Leu at position 11, wherein, between the Leu and one or both amino acids located immediately before or after it, the peptide bond, -CO-NH-, is replaced with a hydroxyethylene group, -CHOH-CH<sub>2</sub>-).

A description of a genus may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 119 F3d 1559, 1569, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412), the court held that a generic statement which defines a genus of nucleic acids by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that, while applicants are not required to disclose every species

Art Unit: 1655

encompassed by a genus, the description of the genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the claimed genus. At section B(1), the court states “An adequate written description of a DNA ... requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention”.

There are species of the claimed genus disclosed that is within the scope of the claimed genus, *i.e.* SEQ ID NO:3 (Leu-Val-Met-Leu). The disclosure of a single disclosed species may provide an adequate written description of a genus when the species disclosed is representative of the genus. However, the present claim encompasses numerous species that are not further described. There is substantial variability among the species.

One of skill in the art would not recognize from the disclosure that the applicant was in possession of the genus of which comprises the genus of a compound consisting of an amino acid sequence which consists of at least three consecutive amino acids of the amino acid sequence, SEQ ID NO: 1 (Val-Val-Ile-Ala-Thr-Val-Ile-Val-Ile-Thr-Leu-Val-Met-Leu-Lys-Lys-Lys, Including Leu at position 11, wherein, between the Leu and one or both amino acids located immediately before or after it, the peptide bond, -CO-NH-, is replaced with a hydroxyethylene group, -CHOH-CH<sub>2</sub>-.

The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, *i.e.*, structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. In the

Art Unit: 1655

instant case, the specification fails to provide sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural or functional features, or critical conserved regions, of the genus and subgenera of proteins to be used in the claimed composition. There is not even identification of any particular portion of the structure that must be conserved. Structural features that could distinguish the proteins in the genus from others are missing from the disclosure. The specification and claims do not provide any description of what other changes should be made. There is no description of the other sites (other than those which applicant has possession of) at which variability may be tolerated and there is no information regarding the relation of structure to function. The general knowledge and level of those skilled in the art does not supplement the omitted description because specific, not general, guidance is what is needed. Furthermore, the prior art does not provide compensatory structural or correlative teachings sufficient to enable one of skill to isolate and identify the polypeptides encompassed. Thus, no identifying characteristics or properties of the instant polypeptides are provided such that one of skill would be able to predictably identify the encompassed molecules as being identical to those instantly claimed. Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus. One of skill in the art would not reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus or each subgenus.

The specification does not “clearly allow persons of skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed” (see *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

All other claims depend directly or indirectly from the rejected claim and are, therefore, also rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph for the reasons set forth above.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4, 14 and 16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 13 and 14 of copending Application No.11/664,714. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the ‘714 application reads on a variant of SEQ ID NO:2, Val at 635 through Lys at 651 along with an anti-amyloid disease drug containing

Art Unit: 1655

the variant protein or peptide, which reads on instant sequences , SEQ ID NO:1, 2 and 3, and the use of the instant compound as an inhibitor of amyloid protein production.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu et al. (J. of Biol. Chem., 2001, vol. 276, pp-43756-43760, #AX) in view of Konvalinka et al. (Eur. J. Biochem., 1997, vol. 250, pp-559-566).

The instant claims are drawn to a compound consisting of an amino acid sequence which consists of the amino acid sequence, SEQ ID NO: 3 (Leu-Val-Met-Leu) wherein, between the Leu at position 1, and the Val at position 2, the peptide bond, -CO-NH-, is replaced with a hydroxyethylene group, -CHOH-CH<sub>2</sub>-.

Yu et al. discloses Leu-645 and Val-646, of amyloid precursor protein (APP), several amino acids to the scissile bonds for the production of amyloid beta protein peptides. The major cleavage site is between Leu-645 and Val-646 of APP 695, whereas a second cleavage site is

Art Unit: 1655

between Met-647 and Leu-648 of APP 695. The sequence from Leu-645 to Leu-648 reads Leu-Val-Met-Leu. See, for example, abstract and page 43759, figure 3-D. This reads on instant claims 1-4 as they read on instant SEQ ID NO: 3. Yu does not disclose the replacement of the peptide bond, -CO-NH-, replaced with a hydroxyethylene group, -CHOH-CH<sub>2</sub>-.

Konvalinka et al. discloses tetrapeptides with the scissile bond replaced by hydrolysable hydroxyethylene or hydroxyethylamine isostere. See, for example, abstract and page 561, table 1, compounds Ia, Ib, IIa, IIb, IIIa and IIIb. This reads on instant claims 1-4 as they read on instant SEQ ID NO:3, wherein, between the Leu at position 1, and the Val at position 2, the peptide bond, -CO-NH-, is replaced with a hydroxyethylene group, -CHOH-CH<sub>2</sub>-.

One would have been motivated to have combined the teachings of Yu et al. with the disclosure of Konvalinka et al. because Yu discloses the possibility that proteolysis between Leu-645 and Val-646 is obligatory for subsequent endo-or exoproteolytic activity events necessary for generating peptides. See, for example, page 43758, second column.

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

***Conclusion***

All claims are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roy Teller whose telephone number is 571-272-0971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang, can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Christopher R. Tate/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655